

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of April 5, 2006.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 4-11, 14-18, 20-31, 33, and 34 remain in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 19, and 32 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-18, 20, 22, 23, 26 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,087) in view of Newell Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,666).

Claims 8, 9, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado in view of Newell and in further view of Kageyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,757).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado in view of Newell, and further in view of Applicant's prior art.

Claims 24 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado in view of Newell and in further view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,299).

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Newell.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krist, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,015).

The Claims Distinguish over the References of Record

Claim 16 calls for amending the job model to select a different thread for finishing of the job in response to a finisher not being available. Newell fails to teach amending the job model in response to unavailability of a device. Newell is limited to determining the possible print paths through a system, and all devices associated with the print paths. This happens before printing occurs. For each job, Newell designates what each component's task is in the current job, (co. 9, lines 14-21) but Newell states nothing about when a

finisher becomes unavailable. The new base reference, Salgado, also does not teach amending the job model in response to unavailability of a finisher. Salgado displays a message, and holds related services, (Salgado, col. 4, lines 49-53) but does not re-route them. Neither Salgado nor Newell select a different thread for finishing of the job in response to a finisher not being available. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 16**, and **claims 4-11, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20-31** dependent therefrom, distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 17 calls for creating different job segments in order to conform to the amended job model. As discussed above, Salgado and Newell fail to teach amending the print job. It is therefore respectfully submitted that notwithstanding its patentability by virtue of its dependence on claim 16, **claim 17** further defines patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 33 now calls for altering a job thread in response to reports of unavailable devices. Like the combination of Salgado and Newell above, the combination of Allen and Newell fails to teach this limitation. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 33** distinguishes patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 34 calls for the finishing device to receive electronic instructions for finishing the print media before the printing apparatus applies markings to the print media. The cited portion of Krist (col. 10, lines 53-63) appears to be concerned with the printer, and not a finishing device, as it is called for by **claim 34**. Reduction, enlargement, rotation and halftoning are aspects of printing. Krist even says that these operations may be required by a remote printer. It appears that this section of Krist does not teach the above mentioned limitation of claim 34. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Krist does not anticipate claim 34 and that **claim 34** defines patentably over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 4-11, 14-18, 20-31, 33, and 34) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Jun 26, 2006
Date

Patrick R. Roche
Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582